

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the Advisory Action and in the previous Office Action dated January 29, 2003. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the above amendments to the claim and the following remarks.

At the outset, it will be noted that claims 15, 17, 19 and 20 are allowable while claim 16 stands rejected. No new claims have been added herein.

Claim 16 was rejected on the basis that the application taught the method for grape crops and not grapes. Thus, claim 16 has been amended herein to refer to grape crops rather than grapes.

Claim 16 had been rejected as being anticipated by DeMil U.S. Patent 4,797,151. It had been the Examiner's position that this reference inherently taught an increase in the sugar contents of grapes. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, the DeMil reference teaches increasing the floral fertility of plants by treating the plant between floral induction and the end of inflorescence, see column 1, lines 41-45. The DeMil reference teaches that by treating the plant during this period of

time, the amount of fruit generated by the plant is increased. Specifically, with respect to grapes, the DeMil reference teaches that the number of grapes is greatly increased, see column 2, lines 55-60. This is directly opposite the present invention. Increasing the output of the grapes will inherently decrease the sugar production. In fact, it is well-known that in order to increase sugar production, the number of grapes that are on the vine must be decreased. This is one of the reasons why the vines are often trimmed so as to decrease the volume of grapes produced and allow for an increase in the sugar content of the fewer grapes that are allowed to grow.

What applicants discovered in the present invention is that by treating the grapes when they are on the vine, the sugar content of the grapes can be increased. Thus, the present invention does not deal with fertility or the increase in grape production. Rather, the present invention is directed to increasing the sugar content of the grapes that are already on the vine. Thus, applicants treatment goes directly contrary to the teaching of DeMil since applicants are teaching increasing the sugar content whereas DeMil is teaching decreasing the sugar content. As brought out in the specification at page 2, line 22, using the copper salts of caprylic amino acids on the grapes, the sugar content of the grapes are increased. This means that the vines are treated when the

grapes are on the vine. Thus, the present invention is clearly distinguishable from the teachings of DeMil because the present invention is increasing sugar content whereas DeMil is decreasing sugar content and the present invention is treating the grape crop when the grapes are on the vine whereas DeMil is treating the vines during flowering.

Furthermore, it is submitted that DeMil teaches away from the present invention because DeMil is teaching specifically increasing fertility and production of grapes. Increasing production of grapes inherently decreases sugar content. Thus, DeMil is teaching directly away from the present invention. Respectfully, claim 16 is patentable over the teachings of DeMil since DeMil neither teaches nor suggests the present invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Enclosed herewith is Form PTO-2038 to cover the cost for filing the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) which is being filed concurrently herewith and the cost of the extension. Should any additional fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this application in pending

condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization
given to debit account #02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

MUSERLIAN, LUCAS AND MERCANTI

DCL:pd
Tel. 212-661-8000
Fax. 212-661-8002

By Donald C. Lucas
Donald C. Lucas - #31,275
Attorney for Applicants